

### REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed the application light of the June 29, 2007 Office Action. To further prosecution, Applicant has amended claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, and 28 to clarify the subject captured thereby. For at least the reasons presented below, Applicant submits that the currently pending claims are allowable over the cited patent literature. Applicant therefore requests favorable action for this case.

#### Section 103 Rejections

The Examiner rejects claims 1-38 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2004/0162802 naming Jeffery Jonas as the inventor (“Jonas”). Detailed Action ¶ 6. Applicant disagrees.

To render a claim prima facie unpatentable under § 103 based on a reference, an Examiner must establish that the reference or the knowledge generally available to one skilled in the art provide a reason for modifying the reference, that there is a reasonable expectation of success in making the modification, and that the modified reference teach all of the claim’s limitations. M.P.E.P. § 2143. Furthermore, the modified reference cannot alter the principle of operation of the reference. *Id.* Jonas, however, fails to teach all of the limitations of any of claims 1-38.

Claim 1 is an independent claim containing limitations not taught by Jonas. Claim 1, as amended, recites:

A method for communication path analysis, the method comprising:  
retrieving a first communication path rule and a second communication path rule for an access control device, each rule comprising at least one path attribute type specifying at least one attribute range and at least one path operation type specifying at least one operation;  
inserting the first rule into a database;  
determining, for at least one path attribute type, whether at least a portion of an attribute range of the second rule corresponds to at least a portion of an attribute range of the first rule; and  
when at least a portion of an attribute range of the second rule does not correspond to at least a portion of an attribute range of the first rule for the

analyzed path attribute type, inserting the non-corresponding portion of the attribute range of the second rule into the database, along with the at least one operation of the second rule.

Nowhere, however, does Jonas teach “retrieving a first communication path rule and a second communication path rule for an access control device, each rule comprising at least one path attribute type specifying at least one attribute range and at least one path operation type specifying at least one operation.” Quite to the contrary, Jonas teaches simply comparing records in a second data set against records in a first data set. ¶¶ 30-31. The records in Jonas may, for example, represent listings in a telephone directory. ¶ 6. Thus, Jonas fails to teach these limitations of claim 1. For similar reasons, Jonas also fails to teach “determining, for at least one path attribute type, whether at least a portion of an attribute range of the second rule corresponds to at least a portion of an attribute range of the first rule” and “when at least a portion of an attribute range of the second rule does not correspond to at least a portion of an attribute range of the first rule for the analyzed path attribute type, inserting the non-corresponding portion of the attribute range of the second rule into the database, along with the at least one operation of the second rule.” For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Jonas fails to teach all of the limitations of claim 1 and, hence, requests the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejection thereof.

Claims 2-11 depend from claim 1 and, hence, contain all of its limitations, which have already been shown to distinguish over Jonas. Claims 2-11 also contain additional limitations that Jonas fails to teach.

For example, claim 7, as amended, specifies that “determining whether an attribute range of the second rule corresponds to an attribute range of the first rule for at least one path attribute type comprises performing a set difference operation between the attribute range of the second rule and the attribute range of the first rule for the at least one path attribute type; and inserting an attribute of the second rule that does not correspond to an attribute of the first rule into the database comprises inserting the results of the set difference operation into the database.”

Nowhere, however, does Jonas teach attribute ranges, much less performing a set difference

operation between attribute ranges and/or inserting the results of the set difference operation into a database. Applicant notes the Examiner's assertion to the contrary, Detailed Action ¶ 13, but the portion of Jonas on which the Examiner relies at best discloses that a data match may be made on less than identical data, ¶ 31. This teaches nothing regarding attribute ranges, performing a set difference operation between attribute ranges, and/or inserting the results of the set difference operation into a database. Thus, Jonas fails to teach the limitations of this claim.

As another example, claim 8, as amended, specifies that "inserting the portion of the attribute range of the second rule that does not correspond to the portion of the attribute range of the first rule into the database comprises attempting to group at least one type of non-corresponding attributes of the second rule into ranges." Nowhere, however, does Jonas teach anything regarding grouping attributes into ranges. Applicant notes the Examiner's assertion to the contrary, Detailed Action ¶ 14, but the portion of Jonas on which the Examiner relies discloses nothing about range, much less grouping attribute ranges, ¶ 31.

As a further example, claim 11, as amended, specifies that "determining whether at least a portion of an attribute range of the second rule corresponds to at least a portion of an attribute range of the first rule for at least one path attribute type is performed for a set of communication path operations." Nowhere, however, does Jonas teach analyzing an attribute range for a set of communication path operations.

For at least these reasons, and for the reasons given with respect to claim 1, Applicant submits that claim 2-11 are distinguishable over Jonas. Applicant therefore requests the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejection of these claims.

Claim 12 is another independent claim, and contains limitations analogous to those of claim 1. For at least the reasons given with respect to claim 1 therefore, Applicant submits that claim 12 is also allowable over Jonas. Applicant therefore requests the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejection of this claim.

Claims 13-19 depend from claim 12 and, hence, contain all of its limitations, which have already been shown to distinguish over Jonas. For reasons analogous to those discussed with

respect to claims 2-11, claims 13-19 also contain additional limitations that Jonas fails to teach. Applicant therefore requests the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejection of these claims.

Claim 20 is an additional independent claim that contains limitations analogous to those of claim 1. For at least the reasons given with respect to claim 1 therefore, Applicant submits that claim 20 is also allowable over Jonas. Applicant therefore requests the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejection of this claim.

Claims 21-28 depend from claim 20 and, hence, contain all of its limitations, which have already been shown to distinguish over Jonas. For reasons analogous to those discussed with respect to claims 2-11, claims 21-28 also contain additional limitations that Jonas fails to teach. Applicant therefore requests the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejection of these claims.

Claim 29 is another independent claim. Claim 29 recites:

A method for communication path analysis, the method comprising:  
receiving a database query for a database comprising communication path rules for an access control device, each rule comprising at least one path attribute type specifying at least one attribute and at least one path operation type specifying at least one operation;  
searching the database for rules that satisfy the query; and  
generating a user interface to present the results of the search.

Nowhere, however, does Jonas teach “receiving a database query for a database comprising communication path rules for an access control device, each rule comprising at least one path attribute type specifying at least one attribute and at least one path operation type specifying at least one operation.” In fact, Jonas makes no mention of a database for communication path rules, much receiving a query for such. Moreover, the Examiner does not indicate any teachings in this regard. Detailed Action ¶ 18. For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that Jonas fails to teach the limitations of claim 29 and, hence, request the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejections thereof.

Claims 30-33 depend from claim 29 and, hence, contain all of its limitations, which have already been shown to distinguish over Jonas. Claims 30-33 also contain additional limitations that Jonas fails to teach. For example, claim 33 specifies that “the database comprises a communication path rule for a second access control device.” Nowhere, however, does Jonas

teach such a database. Thus, Jonas fails to teach all of the limitations of claim 33. For at least these reasons, and for the reasons give with respect to claim 29, Applicant submits that claims 30-33 possess limitations not taught by Jonas. Applicant therefore requests the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejection thereof of these claims.

Claim 34 is an independent claim that contains limitations analogous to those of claim 29. For at least the reasons given with respect to claim 29 therefore, Applicant submits that claim 34 is also allowable over Jonas. Applicant therefore requests the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejection of this claim.

Claims 35-37 depend from claim 34 and, hence, contain all of its limitations, which have already been shown to distinguish over Jonas. For reasons analogous to those discussed with respect to claims 30-33, claims 35-37 also contain additional limitations that Jonas fails to teach. Applicant therefore requests the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejection of these claims.

Claim 38 is an additional independent claim that contains limitation not taught by Jonas. Claim 38 recites:

A system for communication path analysis, the system comprising:  
a communication rule analyzer comprising:  
a relational database operable to store, receive queries for, and search communication path rules, each rule comprising at least two path attribute types specifying at least one attribute and at least one path operation type specifying at least one operation, the database comprising separate tables for the path attribute types and the path operation type; and  
an extraction tool operable to:  
retrieve a first communication path rule and a second communication path rule for an access control device,  
insert the first rule into the database,  
perform a set difference operation between path attribute types of the second rule and the first rule,  
insert the result of the difference operation into the database, along with the at least one operation of the second rule,  
retrieve a first communication path rule for a second access control device, and  
insert the rule into the database.

Applicant : Jan Pachl  
Serial No. : 10/675,856  
Filed : September 30, 2003  
Page : 16 of 17

Attorney Docket No.: 14012-040002/70-02-035.1

Claim 38 contains limitations analogous to those of claims 1, 7, and 29. For at least the reasons give with respect to those claims, Applicant submits that claim 38 is also distinguishable over Jonas. Applicant therefore requests the Examiner to withdraw the § 103 rejection of this claim.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that a good faith effort has been made to advance the prosecution of this application and that the application is allowable over the objections and rejections expressed in the Office Action. Applicant therefore requests favorable action for this case. If, however, any issues exist that may be advanced by telephone conference, Applicant requests that the Examiner contact its below-listed attorney.

Applicant believes that all of the Examiner's objections and rejections to the application have been addressed. Thus, Applicant's failure to address any objections or rejections should not be taken as acquiescence to any finding of the Examiner. Moreover, Applicant's arguments herein against the Examiner's findings should not be construed as Applicant's only basis for countering the findings. Applicant has made these arguments to illustrate the errors in the Examiner's findings and to expeditiously move the case forward.

Applicant does not believe that this paper requires any adjustment in fees. If, however, Applicant is mistaken, please apply any charges or credits to deposit account 05-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: October 1, 2007

/William R. Borchers/

William R. Borchers

Reg. No. 44,549

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1717 Main Street  
Suite 5000  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Telephone: (214) 747-5070  
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091